RESEARCH PROGRAM ON Livestock and Fish

CGIAR

More meat, milk and fish by and for the poor

CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish
2012 Performance Monitoring Report

Lead Center: International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
CGIAR Center partners: CIAT, ICARDA, WorldFish
Contact: Tom Randolph (t.randolph@cgiar.org)

www.livestockfish.cgiar.org

May 2013

WorldFish

ILRI
INTERNATIONAL LIVESTOCK RESEARCH INSTITUTE

CIAT

CGIAR is a global partnership that unites organizations engaged in research for a food secure future. The CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish aims to increase the productivity of small-scale livestock and fish systems in sustainable ways, making meat, milk and fish more available and affordable across the developing world. The Program brings together four CGIAR Centers: the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) with a mandate on livestock; WorldFish with a mandate on aquaculture; the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), which works on forages; and the International Center for Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), which works on small ruminants. http://livestockfish.cgiar.org

The Program thanks all donors and organizations who globally supported its work through their contributions to the **CGIAR Fund**.

© 2013

This publication is licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Unported License. To view this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/. Unless otherwise noted, you are free to copy, duplicate, or reproduce, and distribute, display, or transmit any part of this publication or portions thereof without permission, and to make translations, adaptations, or other derivative works under the following conditions:

ATTRIBUTION. The work must be attributed, but not in any way that suggests endorsement by the publisher or the author(s).

NON-COMMERCIAL. This work may not be used for commercial purposes.

SHARE ALIKE. If this work is altered, transformed, or built upon, the resulting work must be distributed only under the same or similar license to this one.

ilri.org
better lives through livestock
ILRI is a member of the CGIAR Consortium

Box 30709, Nairobi 00100, Kenya
Phone: +254 20 422 3000
Fax: +254 20 422 3001
Email: ILRI-Kenya@cgiar.org

Box 5689, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Phone: +251 11 617 2000
Fax: +251 11 617 2001
Email: ILRI-Ethiopia@cgiar.org

Contents

ilri.org
better lives through livestock
ILRI is a member of the CGIAR Consortium

Box 30709, Nairobi 00100, Kenya
Phone: +254 20 422 3000
Fax: +254 20 422 3001
Email: ILRI-Kenya@cgiar.org

Box 5689, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Phone: +251 11 617 2000
Fax: +251 11 617 2001
Email: ILRI-Ethiopia@cgiar.org

Acronyms

A4NH	CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health
ACIAR	Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research
BMZ	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (Germany)
CIAT	International Center for Tropical Agriculture
DAGRIS	Domestic Animal Genetic Resources Information System
DDF	Dairy Development Forum (Tanzania)
DREMS	Data recording and management system
ECF	East Coast fever
EMBRAPA	Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN
FEAST	Feed Assessment Tool
GIFT	Genetic Improvement in Farmed Tilapia
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
IDO	Intermediate development outcomes
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
ITM	Infection and Treatment Method vaccine
NIRS	Near Infrared Spectroscopy
PIM	CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions and Markets
PPMC	Program Planning and Management Committee
SNV	Netherlands Development Organization
SPAC	Science and Partnership Advisory Committee
TechFit	A tool for feed technology prioritization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WRI	Water Research Institute (Ghana)

A. Key Messages

A.1 Progress and challenges

The vision of the CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish is for the health, livelihoods and future prospects of the poor and vulnerable, especially women and children, to be transformed through consumption of adequate amounts of meat, milk and fish and through benefits from improved incomes and livelihood by participating in the associated animal source food value chains. The program seeks to achieve this vision by increasing the productivity of small-scale livestock and fish production systems and improving the performance of their associated value chains.

The program proposed a new model for enhancing the relevance, urgency and impact of its research. It is designed to bring together collective capacity within CGIAR to demonstrate how research can develop appropriate solutions as integrated interventions for pro-poor transformation of selected value chains and work towards their implementation at scale by development partners. Through this focus on transforming selected value chains, the program is committed to stimulating large development interventions that will translate our research into impact at scale. The process also defines longer-term research to prepare the future breakthroughs that will be needed to ensure the continued viability and growth of these value chains.

This model is a new way of working for the CGIAR and requires reorienting capacity, mobilizing new resources and establishing new types of partnerships to engage effectively in the selected value chains. The program officially began in January 2012 and this first year has been devoted to establishing the institutional and scientific frameworks within which this reorientation is taking place. The program has benefited from a large body of pre-existing research relevant to its mission, and the program has continued to maintain this pipeline, generating a number of exciting results during the year.

Momentum has been quickly achieved in three of the nine selected value chains.[1] Bilateral-funded projects in the value chains for smallholder dairying in Tanzania, smallholder pigs in Uganda and aquaculture in Egypt have enabled the program to begin deploying its value chain-based approach. These projects have allowed the program to engage with partners and stakeholders and create support for a joint pro-poor research and development agenda targeting the selected value chain, consolidating related research activities and undertaking a value chain assessment process. The CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH) also initiated an associated assessment of the public health dimensions in each of these value chains.

The value chain approach requires new methods and scientific rigour to demonstrate its value. **A toolkit of rapid value chain assessment instruments** was successfully developed in collaboration with the CGIAR Research Program on Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM) and is being adapted to each species and value chain. The instruments guide researchers and development practitioners in a comprehensive characterization of the technical and institutional dimensions of the value chain which describes the baseline situation and permits preliminary identification of opportunities for improving its pro-poor performance. Already reflected in the toolkit is the mainstreaming of gender analysis, which is one of the main objectives defined in the program's **gender strategy**. The strategy defines a gender agenda that includes both an 'accommodative' approach for developing gender-sensitive technologies and development strategies, and exploring a 'transformative' approach to address the more fundamental inequities that constrain women's full participation in value chain development.

The program's agenda on technology research concentrates on the three main technical drivers of animal productivity: health, genetics and nutrition. These have been the core of the research undertaken in the past by the four partner centers, and much of the **existing pipeline of work in these areas is being aligned to support improving productivity** in the program's selected value chains.

To maintain this momentum and orient it to have even greater impact in the selected value chains, the program is aspiring to better integration across the partner centers with shared capacity and understanding for the value chain approach and working towards interventions at scale. Progress was made in 2012 through joint planning to identify the

[1] The Livestock and Fish program proposal listed eight value chains (p. 17), one of which included aquaculture value chains for Uganda and Egypt. The program has since considered these as distinct and so now counts nine value chains.

teams and articulate the program implementation strategy. Developing a common evaluation framework in 2013 will be key to consolidating this progress.

A.2 Two most significant achievements/success stories

Lack of quality seed is a major constraint to both aquaculture productivity and production. WorldFish and partners have successfully used selective breeding approaches to develop the Genetically Improved Farmed Tilapia (GIFT) strain of Nile tilapia (*Oreochromis niloticus*), now widely used throughout Asia in countries such as the Philippines, Thailand, Bangladesh, India, China and Malaysia. To replicate the successes of GIFT, in 1999 WorldFish and Ghana's Water Research Institute (WRI) initiated a program for **the breeding and selection of indigenous Nile tilapia for faster growth in Ghana**. After multiple generations of selection, a new fast-growing strain, the Akosombo strain, was produced and recently made available to farmers. The Akosombo strain grows about 30% faster than other farmed tilapia in the region, enabling fish farmers to harvest after six instead of the usual eight months. The Akosombo strain, which also has a higher survival rate, has rapidly gained acceptance by fish farmers and hatchery managers in Ghana. In 2008, WorldFish, WRI, FAO and partners began to work towards extending the benefits of genetically improved tilapias to other countries in the Volta Basin e.g. Burkina Faso. By the end of 2012, there were about 15 medium to large-sized hatcheries and approximately 540 farmers in Ghana using the Akosombo strain. Supply of the Akosombo strain is currently struggling to keep pace with demand. Results from a similar program in Egypt for the Abbassa strain is noted elsewhere in this report. The success of the fish breeding program in Ghana and elsewhere clearly illustrates the significant contribution that selective breeding programs can bring to improving aquaculture value chains for the benefit of poor producers and consumers. The Livestock and Fish Program is seeking how to best support its partners in further developing productive fish strains and in scaling out dissemination to farmers.

The second significant achievement is an early success in preparing for impact in the dairy value chain in Tanzania. As work has been initiated there, the focus of the first phase of engagement has been to establish strategic partnerships and align stakeholders to support the program's value chain transformation agenda. In this case, this initial engagement was able to build on ongoing policy collaboration to improve milk safety in Tanzania and contribute directly to establishing a **Dairy Development Forum** (DDF) at a stakeholder meeting held in Morogoro, Tanzania, on 9 March 2012. The Forum was subsequently endorsed in June 2012 by the Annual Council of the Tanzania Dairy Board. The Forum is envisaged as a learning platform and an informal mechanism for horizontal coordination of development activities to address systemic bottlenecks and co-create appropriate solutions at national and milk-shed levels. Its membership comes from across all key public and private sector players in the dairy sector. The Forum offers a potential particularly strategic platform for advocacy to promote the required policy shift towards a more inclusive dairy development in Tanzania. ILRI has been nominated to be part of the Advisory Committee to support the Secretariat of the Forum. The program provided technical and financial support to establishing the Forum anticipating that it will provide visibility nationally for the pro-poor strategies for dairy value chain development being tested by the Livestock and Fish program and serve as a critical link in the program's impact pathway.

A.3 Financial summary

The program executed $17.02 million (76%) of the total 2012 $22.53 million budget. The realized budget was in turn 76% of the approved budget of $29.73 million in the program proposal. The shortfall is explained by lower than expected W3 and bilateral funding which was only half of what was projected in the program proposal. The shortfall limited the implementation of the program in several value chains and research areas. Underspending of the CGIAR Fund portion of the budget ($7.72 million executed of a $10.33 million total budget: 75%) reflected transition effects as many key positions were in the process of being filled to implement activities. Gender research accounted for 6.6% of expenditures and 5.8% of the realized budget.

B. Impact Pathway and Intermediate Development Outcomes

The Results Strategy Framework for the program defines intermediate development outcomes (IDOs) based on program logic as outcomes relating to increased productivity, more and better quality food supplies, improved incomes—especially for women, more of the nutrient gap met by animal source foods, lower environment impacts, and a more enabling policy and investment environment. Over a 12-year horizon, the program commits to ensuring these outcomes affect at least 500,000 households in the target value chains: during 2013, an exercise will be conducted to develop more detailed projections by value chain. The IDOs are continuing to be refined as part of the Consortium-wide harmonization effort and as the program's evaluation framework is developed.

Two main impact pathways are envisaged. The first pathway is through a process of deliberately orienting research that lead to actionable packages of pro-poor technologies and strategies in each of the selected value chains, to be subsequently implemented at scale as development interventions. This process involves engagement with stakeholders and partners—including development partners, assessing the pro-poor performance of the value chain, identifying and testing potential technical and institutional strategies for upgrading the value chain, and generating an evidence base to attract the development investment needed to take it to scale as an intervention. These interventions will target poor rural households who keep livestock or derive their livelihoods by providing input or market services, together with poor rural and urban consumers and nutritionally vulnerable women and children. Two types of progress will be measured: (i) whether the technologies and institutional strategies being proposed are translating into measurable improvements in the performance and distribution of benefits of the selected value chain to the targeted beneficiaries; and (ii) whether the process just described for the program's value chain development approach is on track and likely to achieve its objectives. Measuring progress on these two levels offers methodological challenges, some of which will be subject of program research, such as methods for monitoring the physical, economic and welfare performance of a value chain. An objective of the ongoing development of program's evaluation framework is to define relevant and feasible indicators for what we are able to measure at present.

The second impact pathway seeks to influence practices and policies globally so that research results from the program are taken up more widely outside of the program sites and value chains. Here, key indicators relate to the visibility the program is able to create for its results to foster an enabling environment and enhance their ability to attract investment for their deployment elsewhere.

Definition of the IDOs and associated impact pathways has confirmed the need to increase attention to two areas that had not been sufficiently envisaged in the activities described in the Program proposal; these relate to assessing environmental implications of value chain development and better nutritional targeting of the animal source foods produced.

The program is currently recording two types of baseline data, which may evolve as the evaluation framework is defined. These include situational analyses for each value chain that describe the current status of the target value chain with measures based mostly on secondary data related to the IDOs, and household and market surveys that provide a snapshot (but are not likely to be generalizable or necessarily appropriate for impact assessment at some later point) of specific indicators.

C. Progress along the Impact Pathway

C.1 Major achievements

As the various Consortium evaluation frameworks are still under development, the program is relying primarily on tracking its planned activities and milestones to evaluate it progress. It has attempted to respond to the Consortium indicators where possible and will be working to develop its own framework and indicators and to set targets for the Consortium indicators during its planning process in 2013.

The program held a series of planning meetings for the Themes and value chains. These meetings were critical for identifying the cross-center teams, developing together detailed implementation plans and longer-term strategies, and agreeing on initial work plans. These planning processes faced considerable challenges, however, due to the ongoing organizational transition within each center to adapt to their participation in the various CGIAR programs. In addition, to align itself with emerging guidelines from the Consortium, the program streamlined its structure, reducing from the original 3 Themes divided into 9 Components to a new structure of 6 Themes without Components. As the result, the planning process was not fully completed in 2012 and establishment of the Program Participant Agreements delayed.

As highlighted in Section A, the program was able to begin directly deploying the value chain approach in three of the selected value chains: Egypt, Tanzania and Uganda. The aspiration was to initiate the value chain approach in all nine value chains, but given the structure of funding for the program, fully implementing this approach in a value chain requires first mobilizing adequate bilateral project funding. In the three countries cited, funding had already been secured in 2011 in anticipation of the program, so activities could be initiated immediately. This has encouraged rapid formation and engagement of the cross-center teams responsible for the development of the methodologies

supporting the value chain approach. Within the three value chains, the teams have begun close collaboration with strategic research and development partners and the process of stakeholder engagement while implementing the initial assessment activities, including a site selection process and situational analyses of the target sector (e.g. dairy sector in Tanzania). Lower levels of activity have been initiated in the remaining value chains based on existing legacy projects as bilateral funding is sought for more comprehensive activities. In the case of aquaculture in Uganda, a more rigorous re-assessment of the potential for significant growth and impact led to the decision to withdraw, demonstrating the evidence-based nature of decision-making adopted by the program.

Establishing a flagship value chain project in each focus country is demonstrating benefits in attracting and creating synergies with complementary restricted projects and other CGIAR Research Programs to address the full range of research that can be applied to value chain development. In Tanzania, for example, the flagship dairy research-for-development project funded by Irish Aid has been able to add value to and benefit from integration with a feed market research project funded by IFAD, a food safety research project funded by BMZ (implemented under A4NH), a public health and nutrition assessment study funded by ACIAR (under A4NH), an animal health assessment project, also funded by BMZ, and a livestock data project in collaboration with FAO and the World Bank supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (under the PIM research program). The BMZ-funded food safety project implemented by the A4NH research program has taken responsibility for food safety aspects of the value chain approach in several of the Livestock and Fish value chains, thereby creating synergies and avoiding duplication of efforts across the CGIAR Research Programs. In other value chains (Nicaragua, India, Vietnam, Ethiopia), legacy activities related to the target value chains and initial scoping activities supported with program CG Fund monies permitted modest levels of initial engagement while bilateral funding is sought to support a more active deployment

With respect to technology development, the focus of the centers' existing research and legacy projects were found to align well to the needs of the program, as evidenced by the quality of achievements reported in 2012 coming from their existing research pipelines. The ongoing planning process and findings from the initial phase of assessment in the target value chains will permit refining and strengthening prioritization within the technology development agenda. Certain gaps in capacity within the program have emerged for linking the technology development work more directly to certain types of constraints in the value chain, particularly in the animal health area.

To support implementation of the program, a management unit was established consisting initially of the program director, with a head of development partnership joining later in the year. The Program Planning and Management Committee (PPMC) and Science and Partnership Advisory Committee (SPAC) were appointed and took up their functions. Knowledge sharing and communication support mechanisms were established to support internal planning and communication, to report to external audiences, and to document outputs.

Major achievements are highlighted by Theme; detailed annual reports by theme, center and value chain can be accessed at: http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/2012+Annual+Report.

Theme 1 - Animal health

The objective of this Theme is to generate data and materials to improve the pro-poor management of animal health and food safety in the selected value chains. As part of its initial focus to improve control of the commonly perceived major disease constraints in the value chains selected in sub-Saharan Africa, advances were made in supporting the **delivery of the live East Coast fever (ECF) vaccine** produced by ILRI through a packaging innovation and genomic tools.

Theme 2 - Animal genetics

This Theme is developing improved strains and breeding strategies that sustainably improve animal productivity in emerging small-scale market-oriented livestock and fish production systems. Research to develop genetically improved fish strains culminated in 2012 with **documentation and dissemination of improved strains developed from local populations in six countries**: in the selected value chain in Egypt, but also in Bangladesh, Ghana, India, Malawi and Malaysia. In Egypt, the improved Abbassa strain of Nile tilapia G9 was provided to five brood stock multiplication centers in three major aquaculture governorates during summer of 2012 to be reproduced and their offspring used on fish farms during the 2013 growing season onwards. The improved Akosombo strain of Nile tilapia in Ghana is demonstrating potential for uptake in other countries of the Volta River Basin.

Within three of the target value chains, initial **rapid assessments for improved genetics** were completed. To support efficient and sustainable sheep and goat breeding strategies in Ethiopia, a new partnership with EMBRAPA generated

initial results in adapting EMBRAPA's tailor-made **web-based data recording and management system (DREMS)**. In Asia, capacity was established in four countries to systematically document national genetic resources to inform future improvement and conservation strategies.

Theme 3 - Feeds and forages

This Theme is focusing on developing superior feed and forage options that respond to current and evolving demands to increase meat, milk and fish production while reducing the ecological footprint. An initial activity established **a joint Near Infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS) network** to strengthen the program's capacity for feed quality analysis. Partners were trained in use of the technology and NIRS equations were established for standardizing analysis of crop residues (sorghum, pearl millet, rice, wheat, maize, cowpea, groundnut, chickpea, pigeon pea, lablab), forages (sorghum, pearl millet, Napier, pigeon pea), agro byproducts (bran, oil cakes, hulls and husks, sweet sorghum bagasse) and mixed fodder market samples using open source software and equipment.

Using existing feed resources better requires a simple, rapid, but robust diagnosis of feed resources available on-farm and from the market that relates to livestock needs. Support is then needed in deciding which technical options to apply to improve the use of those feed resources. Two **tools for feed resource assessment and feed intervention prioritizing** to address these challenges were tested and the feed interventions identified were successfully tested in Tanzania, India and Ethiopia. Materials to support their wider dissemination are under preparation. Options for and the economics of improving or supplementing on-farm feed resources through feed and fodder purchase were investigated by a range of **fodder market value chain studies** completed in India, Nigeria and Mali. It became clear that formal and informal fodder markets play a key role in supporting intensification of livestock systems and there are opportunities to improve their efficiency.

Good progress was made towards providing more feed of higher quality from forages, crop residues/agricultural by-products and new feed ingredients. Analyses demonstrated that selection of crop cultivars with superior fodder quality in the stover, straws and haulms will result in price premiums at fodder markets of between 10 to 25% and the response in meat and milk production is of a similar order. In addition, it was learned that small differences in fodder quality of crop residues of 3 to 5% units in digestibility result in large difference in prices and in livestock productivity due to the additive effect of higher fodder quality and higher voluntary feed intake.

CIAT's two Brachiaria breeding programs successfully released **3 new forage varieties** for dissemination. With BMZ funding, field testing of alternative forage legume-based feeds generated evidence that pigs can tolerate well up to 33% of *Vigna*, for instance, with similar live weight gain compared to a conventional diet and at lower cost.

Theme 4 - Value chain development

The Theme works to develop methods for assessing value chains, identifying and testing technical and institutional opportunities to improve their productivity, efficiency and ability to generate benefits for the poor, and translating proven opportunities into development interventions at scale. This requires the development of an integrated approach that considers the target food commodity system as a whole and the interactions, both biophysical and socio-economic, between the different parts of the value chain. Cross-center multidisciplinary teams of researchers were formed and began working together in 2012, both to address the cross-cutting methodological challenges and to begin engaging within each of selected value chains. The engagement process in each value chain is critical to cultivate local ownership of the approach and to establish the strategic partnerships among research and development actors to implement it. **Stakeholder events** to introduce the program have accordingly been organized in each of the selected value chains and the program has established or strengthened project offices in Egypt, Tanzania and Uganda.

The initial task has been to develop an integrated **toolkit for rapid value chain assessment** that adequately captures the range of relevant technical and economic dimensions of the value chain. A generic version is now available, and it has been adapted and tested in several of the value chains. **Rapid value chain assessments** were completed in Tanzania and Egypt and initiated or planned in the remaining value chains. A key component of this toolkit is a situational analysis that describes the national macroeconomic and sectoral context in which the value chain operates, including the policies, other competing value chains, and auxiliary value chains for inputs and services, and identifies trends likely to influence the viability of the target value chain. These studies provide both a baseline from which changes affecting the value chain can be monitored, and the basis for developing an agenda for policy analysis and engagement to create an enabling environment for pro-poor value chain transformation. **Situational analyses** were completed in Tanzania and Uganda, and are being prepared for publication.

The program is looking to move quickly to test and validate best-bet technologies and institutional strategies to serve as the basis for value chain interventions. In Egypt, Uganda and Tanzania, identification and testing of a number of candidate strategies was initiated, and related legacy activities continued in Nicaragua.

Theme 5 - Targeting for sustainable interventions

The Theme ensures that the program focuses on the appropriate value chains and beneficiaries to have the most impact. It also took on responsibility to assess environmental implications of the value chain development promoted by the program. In 2012, the Theme oversaw an **evidence-based selection process** to determine the sites in each country where the program will focus its fieldwork. A methodology protocol was produced, analyses conducted using GIS data, and stakeholders were consulted to ground truth the GIS assessments, which was followed by a site evaluation exercise on the ground. This process was applied in all of selected value chains and summarized in reports. The team also began developing the program's environment agenda by initiating collaboration with FAO on a pilot dairy development carbon-credit scheme and preparing a proposal to develop an *ex-ante* value chain environmental impact assessment framework.

Theme 6 - Gender and learning

The principal focus in 2012 was preparation of the **Program's gender strategy**, the finalization of which was delayed as the partner centers were strengthening their staffing in this area. One of the initial research activities undertaken by the gender team was to mainstream gender into the rapid value chain assessment tools. In Egypt, the program worked with CARE and formed a number of **women retailer organizations** for fish marketing to empower their members and secure more equitable benefits.

C.2 Progress towards outputs

The program devotes science to generating novel technologies and effective strategies that support pro-poor livestock and fish value chain development. The following are key research outputs that were generated in 2012:

- A protocol for producing the ECF vaccine in smaller dose straws will support the delivery of the live ECF vaccine produced by ILRI by facilitating its uptake by owners of smaller dairy herds.
- **DNA sequences for selected genes and other defined genomic sites in a range of *T. parva* strains** were generated. These permit rapid differentiation of strains and isolates, and together with a genomic fingerprint for the live ECF vaccine, provide the basis for cost-effective vaccine quality control and field investigation of vaccine failures, should they occur, to determine if the failure is due to the vaccine not inducing a sufficiently broad immunity.
- The **methods and capacities established to support improved tilapia breeding strategies from local populations** were documented in nine major publications.
- The **Domestic Animal Genetic Resources Information System (DAGRIS) was customized for Asian four countries** and capacity established in each country to use it to document national genetic resources.
- **FEAST, a feed resource assessment tool,** and **TechFit, a feed intervention prioritizing tool**, were successfully tested. It was shown that the FEAST tool describes accurately overall feed resources and yet is context specific enough to detect differences in feed resources within apparently similar conditions, say neighboring villages in the same agro-ecological zone.
- CIAT released **three new forage varieties** for dissemination: *Brachiaria decumbens* x *B. brizantha* x *B. ruziziensis:* Mulato 1 and 2 and Cayman.
- A package of **best aquaculture management practices** was delivered to 648 farmers in Egypt; their impact will be monitored.
- An **evidence-based site selection** protocol produced and applied in six selected value chains.
- The program's **gender strategy** was prepared. The strategy is inspired by the earlier ILRI and the Aquatic Agricultural Systems (AAS) research program gender strategies, and benefited from inputs and guidance from the Consortium Gender Initiative and Network. It includes a commitment to mainstream gender throughout the program's activities, as well as a research agenda ranging from an accommodative approach, i.e. recognizing and addressing the gender implications of the technology development and value chain research,

to experimenting with a transformative approach which tackles the fundamental rules and norms of the society that determine women's participation and ability to benefit from the selected value chain.

C.3 Progress towards the achievement of outcomes

A number of the outputs being achieved by the program or from previous related activities at the partner centers contributed to research or development outcomes during 2012.

Two specific outcomes were achieved in promoting the uptake of ECF vaccination in East Africa. ILRI responded to requests to provide **178,000 doses of the Infection and Treatment Method (ITM) vaccine to distributors** in Tanzania, Malawi, Uganda and Kenya. This is an indication of increasing uptake of the vaccine and brings the total number of doses from the current vaccine batch produced by ILRI which have been released in the region to 705,000. Also, a critical requirement for more widespread commercial uptake was met by successful **registration of the vaccine in Kenya**. Kenya is considered the most important market for the vaccine in the region and key to ensuring sustained provision of supplies to the rest of the region.

The Southern Agricultural Research Institute in Ethiopia secured public funding and began their own independent program to **scale out community based goat and sheep breeding schemes** in Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Region that follow the prototype scheme developed jointly by ICARDA and ILRI. The program is targeting 1,578 households (of which 98 are female-headed) across 14 communities.

Tools to assess feed needs and appropriate feed solutions - FEAST and TechFit - reported in the preceding section were already being taken up and used by development actors in Tanzania, Ethiopia and Uganda independent of program activities.

Adoption of lines from the *Brachiaria* breeding programs at CIAT has been extrapolated through seed sales and supported with periodic impact studies. The results indicate that over the last 10 years, 400,000 to 500,000 ha have been sown with *Brachiaria* hybrids originating from CIAT; figures for 2011 are estimated at 50,000 to 75,000 additional hectares, with 2012 pending, following a trend of exponential increases over time. Several international (ICRISAT, CIMMYT, IRRI) and national crop improvement programs (sorghum and millet in India, maize in Ethiopia) with support from the Theme started to mainstream **phenotyping for straw and stover fodder quality traits in breeding, selection and new cultivars release programs**. This means that new crop cultivars released and promoted will be expected to have superior fodder traits in their residues on a larger scale.

Selection of study sites during 2012 has followed an evidence-based process in consultation with stakeholders in each target value chain. This approach is enhancing awareness and ownership of the program's efforts in each country which will improve subsequent uptake and scaling out of the intervention strategies under development.

C.4 Progress towards impact

The program began developing its theory of change and impact pathways, and expects to complete the process in 2013. The theory of change for the program will help identify the means by which the program's outputs and outcomes are expected to lead to different types of impacts, and this will inform strategic studies to be undertaken by the program to validate the impact pathways.

Previous studies by the Asian Development Bank and the Norwegian Government have established the enormous impacts of earlier breeding programs on productivity and the growth of tilapia aquaculture in Asia; similar studies are ongoing or planned for the strains developed more recently and disseminated in 2012 in Africa.

D. Gender research achievements

Integration of gender is given prominence in the program under its Theme on 'gender and learning.' The cross-center team of gender scientists in the program is working with research scientists and partners to integrate gender into technology development and delivery systems and its value chain development approach, and leading efforts in gender analysis and integration to support the other program Themes. Gender teams have begun to work closely with the

value chain teams to ensure good practices are applied in the value chain and technology research as well as in the cross-cutting work to synthesize data and lessons learned. During 2012, gender scientists from ILRI participated in the development of value chain tools to integrate key gender topics in value chains related to pigs in Uganda, dairy in Tanzania and small ruminants in Ethiopia. Gender scientists from WorldFish worked closely with partners and researchers in Egypt to identify gendered opportunities and constraints in aquaculture value chains. Program researchers in ICARDA contributed to development and piloting of initial value chain tools to assess their ability to capture gendered data in Ethiopia. These activities contributed to the overall program outcome of *"Poor women, men and marginalized groups have improved and more equitable access to affordable animal source foods through gender equitable interventions."*

To contribute to the impact pathway on gender and to build consensus among the program partners, a Gender Strategy was created to define key outcomes and outputs in addition to providing a work plan on deliverables for the next 5 years. This strategy is unique with its shared focus on gender accommodative and transformative approaches and working as a team across the four partner centers to expand and deepen this agenda. The first collaborative meeting was held in December 2012 to establish a shared vision and outputs around gender for the program. The strategy includes key research areas related to women's access and control of resources in the selected value chains, gender equitable technologies of both partners and CGIAR centers, as well as new research in gender transformative approaches, and promises synergies with the evolving agendas of other CGIAR research programs. It also aligns with ILRI's current gender strategy to build capacity among both ILRI staff as well as partner organizations.

Gender equality targets for the value chain countries will be set as the evaluation framework for the program is developed. Indicators will be identified with partners that align both at the CGIAR Consortium and program levels.

Across the program's partner centers, the main challenge identified is lack of staff with gender expertise. At ILRI and WorldFish, hiring of full-time gender scientists is ongoing, and centers are using gender consultants to achieve outputs. Proposals are also being prepared to secure additional funding and opportunities are being explored for working through other funded proposals that align with the agreed gender outputs.

Gender mainstreaming is occurring in value chain countries by gender scientists reviewing all existing and proposed projects related to the Program. Gender scientists are participating in developing value chain assessment tools and contributing to capacity development of staff collecting data. They will also be involved in reviewing and analyzing data from value chain assessments to determine key leverage points to achieve Gender Strategy outputs. Process indicators will also be developed during the first half of 2013 in conjunction with the final gender indicators and impact pathway.

E. Partnerships building achievements

Effective partnership is a coalition of the willing around livestock development that unlocks the potential of others. At the second Global Conference on Agricultural research for Development, the Program and potential collaborators formulated a list of 7 critical success factors that have formed the basis of our partnership strategy. These state that partnerships must be based on development issues, clearly allocate roles, operate as a team, build enabling culture, share reward for results, learn together and frequently review performance and satisfaction.

The program has placed value chain issues before national stakeholders as a basis for alliances for action that can inform research processes. To boost research capability, the program has initiated discussions with two European universities to form strategic partnerships that will serve to fill capacity gaps in value chain and tropical livestock system productivity research. We seek joint applied research programs at apex and country level. In countries of operation, efforts were initiated in 2012 to leverage capacity among research and development collaborators to deliver livestock value chain solutions and test best-bet options.

In 6 countries, we have joined forces with national agricultural research systems and ministries. In Tanzania, with partners we have helped establish a Dairy Development Forum to gather private and public stakeholders into a dairy development process. Here, opportunities are being explored to develop collaboration with SNV and Land O'Lakes within the anticipated expansion of the regional Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation-funded East Africa Dairy Development Project. Under a $4.2 million project funded by the Swiss Development Corporation, CARE Egypt and private sector hatcheries are playing key roles in disseminating the highly productive Abbassa tilapia strain as described

above and means to assure equitable access to women value chain actors in Egypt; in 2012, they trained 648 fish farmers in Best Management Practices and established 2 women retailers groups with a total membership of 75 women. In Uganda and India, national producer associations are involved respectively in smallholder pig and dairy value chain analysis to propose best-bet solutions. In Vietnam and Ethiopia, we are exploring partnerships with the World Bank, USAID and private sector organizations to jointly plan pig and small ruminant value chain development actions. Collaboration with EMBRAPA has begun with the joint development of a small ruminant database.

The program has integrated its work across other CGIAR programs to exploit innovation and avoid duplication. Work was initiated with the A4NH program in Tanzania, Egypt, Uganda and Vietnam to investigate food safety of milk, farmed fish and pork. With the Policies, Institutions and Markets program, we have worked to develop and test of tools for rapid value chain assessment.

F. Capacity building achievements

A major effort in 2012 centered around establishing internal capacity to support the new way of working espoused by the program, deploying the program's value chain development approach in the selected sites. Notwithstanding this internal focus, both short and long term capacity development activities took place in several of the value chains, notably in Egypt, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Uganda, and Vietnam. Combined, 1,894 men and 1,891 women benefited from short-term training on topics such as value chain assessment/analysis, participatory development of best management practices, better feeding and breeding practices, monitoring and evaluation, assessment of animal health, food safety and zoonoses, and Outcome Mapping – to name but a few. In addition, 33 male and 19 female MSc and PhD students are affiliated with the program's value chain work in these countries.

G. Risk Management

Three major risks that may hinder the expected delivery of results by the program include:

1) **Mobilizing sufficient restricted project funding**: The program relies on securing restricted project grants to fund two-thirds of the overall program budget, especially those portions supporting operational costs. As the program began in 2012, the partner centers had only secured roughly half of the restricted project funding needed to implement the approved program, and had only modest success in mobilizing additional funds during 2012. This means that activities could be initiated in a meaningful way in only a subset of the target value chains and in only a subset of the technology research areas. To address this risk of a continued shortfall in restricted project funding, the program is developing a more targeted resource mobilization effort that builds on the strengths emerging from the first year of research: the early results being achieved in certain value chains and research areas are now providing a stronger basis for attracting additional funding. Also importantly, the program has initiated a request to the Fund Council that would permit the program to access additional W2 funding commitments it is attracting from its members.

2) **Poor alignment among partner centers:** During the first year of implementation, the four partner centers have begun to develop a shared understanding of the program and its value chain approach. Many of the activities in this first year, however, have reflected legacy projects and commitments and so have limited the opportunity to implement the value chain work consistent with the program approach. Effective alignment among the partner centers to the value chain approach will become evident as they propose new activities, identify new funding and allocate their resources. To enhance alignment and integration within the program, it is anticipated that the PPMC, with support from the Science and Partnership Advisory Committee, will take a more direct role in reviewing proposed activities and performance of the center teams implementing the program.

3) **Weak program management systems:** Existing management systems across the partner centers have found it difficult to respond to the needs of the program in terms of providing the types of information needed for timely planning and monitoring, especially with respect to budget and staff time allocation. The development of the CGIAR 'one corporate system' (OCS) is expected to address this challenge, and the program has been engaged in advising on implications of program needs for the OCS design.

H. Lessons Learned

H.1 Confidence of indicators

The indicators reported in Table 1 are derived from detailed data presented in the various background reports, which cite the supporting evidence. The evolving definition of the indicators, however, may contribute to some variation in their interpretation.

H.2 Changes in research direction

During 2012, each of the teams for the Themes and the target value chains held planning meetings to begin developing their respective implementation plans. The plans maintained the research directions described in the approved program proposal; no significant changes were made. However, several gaps in capacity among the partner centers were identified that will need to be addressed before the full research agenda can be implemented; in several cases, the partner centers are strengthening their staff resources in the needed areas. These include: gender, herd health and husbandry, macroeconomic and policy analysis, innovation systems, systems analysis, and evaluation.

During the program's proposal approval process, it was recommended that a component on environmental issues be developed. This agenda is being pursued mainly in terms of work on the methods to assess both positive and negative environmental impacts associated with the development of the target value chains, and has been incorporated into the 'Targeting sustainable interventions' Theme. Similarly, the program has recognized that to be consistent with its intended impact pathway and theory of change, it will be important to address more directly how increased availability of animal-source foods can translate into nutritional benefits. A strategy for nutrition-related research will be developed in 2013 as part of the 'Gender and Learning' Theme.

H.3 Lessons learned from evaluation

The program began developing an evaluation framework and will work to finalize it based on the evolving system-wide evaluation framework and definition of Intermediate Development Outcomes. As the result, the indicators have yet to be fully internalized within the program and are only now being benchmarked for the first time.

Qualitative reporting for the first year of implementation has made evident significant variation in the program's ability to engage and initiate activities in the various target value chains, largely due to differential success in mobilizing the needed restricted funding. The program is adapting to this reality by focusing its attention on full implementation of its value chain approach in an initial set of value chains where sufficient momentum is being achieved; it will continue to implement a much lower level of preparatory activities in the remaining value chains as efforts are undertaken to mobilize the resources for the full program there.

I. Financial Report

The financial reports are attached as Annex 2.

Annex 1. Program Indicators of Progress

Detailed explanation for the source of the indicators can be found at **http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/2012+Annual+Report** in the Source of Summary Indicators file and in the various Theme, center and value chain reports posted there. Explanatory notes at the bottom of the table are provided for selected indicators.

	Indicator	Deviation narrative (if actual is more than 10% away from target)	2012		2013	2014
			Target (if available for 2012)	Actual	Target	Target
KNOWLEDGE, TOOLS, DATA						
	1. Number of flagship "products" produced			20[1]	TBD	TBD
	2. % of flagship products produced that have explicit target of women farmers/NRM managers			70%	TBD	TBD
	3. % of flagship products produced that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact			60%	TBD	TBD
	4. Number of "tools" produced			38[2]	TBD	TBD
	5. % of tools that have an explicit target of women farmers			72%	TBD	TBD
	6. % of tools assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact			72%	TBD	TBD
	7. Number of open access databases maintained			14[3]	TBD	TBD
	8. Total number of users of these open access databases			49,386	TBD	TBD
	9. Number of publications in ISI journals produced			78	TBD	TBD
	10. Number of strategic value chains analyzed			24	TBD	TBD
	11. Number of targeted agro-ecosystems analysed/characterised			N/A		
	12. Estimated population of above-mentioned agro-ecosystems			N/A		
CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT AND INNOVATION PLATFORMS						
	13. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by the program (male)			1,894	TBD	TBD
	14. Number of trainees in short-term programs facilitated by the program (female)			1,891	TBD	TBD
	15. Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by the program (male)			33	TBD	TBD
	16.Number of trainees in long-term programs facilitated by program (female)			19	TBD	TBD
	17. Number of multi-stakeholder R4D innovation platforms established for the targeted agro-ecosystems			N/A		
TECHNOLOGIES/PRACTICES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT						
	18. Number of technologies/NRM practices under research in the program (Phase I)			41[4]	TBD	TBD
	19. % of technologies under research that have an explicit target of women farmers			29%	TBD	TBD
	20. % of technologies under research that have been assessed for likely gender-disaggregated impact			12%	TBD	TBD

	21 Number of agro-ecosystems for which program has identified feasible approaches for improving ecosystem services and for establishing positive incentives for farmers to improve ecosystem functions as per the program's recommendations			N/A		
	22. Number of people who will potentially benefit from plans, once finalised, for the scaling up of strategies			N/A		
	23. Number of technologies /NRM practices field tested (phase II)			3[5]	TBD	TBD
	24. Number of agro-ecosystems for which innovations (technologies, policies, practices, integrative approaches) and options for improvement at system level have been developed and are being field tested (Phase II)			N/A		
	25. % of above innovations/approaches/options that are targeted at decreasing inequality between men and women			N/A		
	26. Number of published research outputs from CRP utilised in targeted agro-ecosystems			N/A		
	27.Number of technologies/NRM practices released by public and private sector partners globally (phase III)			1[6]	TBD	TBD
POLICIES IN VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT						
	28. Numbers of Policies/ Regulations/ Administrative Procedures Analyzed (Stage 1)			19	TBD	TBD
	29. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation (Stage 2)			3	TBD	TBD
	30. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures presented for legislation(Stage 3)			1	TBD	TBD
	31. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures prepared passed/approved (Stage 4)			0		
	32. Number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures passed for which implementation has begun (Stage 5)			1	TBD	TBD
OUTCOMES ON THE GROUND						
	33. Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of program's research			20,480	TBD	TBD
	34. Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of program's research			26,105	TBD	TBD

Explanatory Note 1: Number of flagship "products" produced

Tanzania VC Report: 1. Targeting report on animal production value chains for Tanzania 2. Rapid Integrated Assessment of food safety and nutrition tools; World Fish Report 1. New genetically improved strains of Tilapia in Egypt, Ghana, Malawi and Malaysia. 2. New strain of GIFT from Malaysia to Bangladesh; Egypt VC Report: 1. Genetically improved Abbassa strain of Nile tilapia. Mali VC Report: 1. Guidelines for developing national breeding plans 2. Analysis of incentives (disincentives) that support (constrain) sustainable management of threatened ruminant breeds of West Africa 3. Crossbreeding strategies for improved livelihoods; CIAT Report: Tropical forage-based systems to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions; Value Chain Development Theme Report: 1. Dairy market hub interventions 2. Open access Livestock and Fish wikispaces 3. Generic reporting template for situational analysis and rapid VC assessment tools; Uganda VC Report: Tools for the rapid assessment of smallholder pig value chains; Vietnam VC Report: Rapid Integrated Assessment of food safety and nutrition tools; Tanzania VC Report: T1. Three dairy market hubs interventions approaches 2. Rapid Integrated Assessment of food safety and nutrition tools. 3. Ex-ante gender analysis focus group discussions to

understand the role that women and men play in goat and root crop production. 4. ILRI gender strategy 5. Feeds assessment FEAST tool; Mali Value Chain Report: 1. Guidelines for the establishment and facilitation of innovation platforms. India VC Report: 1. Innovation platform approach to induce change in dairy value chain linked to a large rural development program. 2. FEAST tool. Gender Theme Report: 1. Ex-ante gender analysis focus group discussions.

Explanatory Note 2: Number of "tools" produced
ICARDA Report: Tool for assessing genetics-based interventions within rapid VCA; Tanzania VC Report: 1. Breed assessment tool – for assessing breeds kept, sources and breed preferences; Mali VC Report: 1 .Conceptual framework and methodology for the analysis of incentives systems for the sustainable management of endemic ruminant livestock 2. Guidelines for the development of national breeding plans 3. Three Policy briefs for the sustainable management of endemic ruminant livestock; CIAT Report: 1. NIRS equations for predicting fodder 2. Residue processing & smart supplementation 3. Integration of dairy value chain and feed innovation platforms (FEAST) 4. Feed component of VC rapid assessment tool 5. Fodder attribute catalogue 6. Participatory fodder quality assessment; ILRI Report: Total 19 cross-cutting: http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/; World Fish Report: 1. Best Management practice survey methodology 2.Training materials developed through participative process 3.Technology training manuals on 6 different Improved Aquaculture technologies; ICARDA Report: 1. . Gender sensitive rapid VCA toolkit for the small ruminant value chains in Ethiopia; Tanzania VC Report: 1. 1. Participatory epidemiology tool for assessing husbandry practices and animal health related constraints 2. Food safety and zoonoses assessment toolkit 3. Seasonal calendar - for assessing seasonality of rainfall, income, expenditures and labour 4. Community sketch map/institutional interactions tool 5. Activity clock and decision making tool for assessing gender 6. Tool for assessment of decision making and control of resources. 7. Livelihood analysis tool for identification of livelihood activities and income sources.8. Value chain mapping tool for producers 9. Value chain mapping tool for inputs and service providers 10. Value chain mapping for milk traders and vendors; Targeting Theme Report: 3 Value Chain reports to guide site selection; Mali VC Report: 1. Tool for monitoring and evaluation of innovation platforms.

Explanatory Note 3: Number of open access databases maintained
ICARDA Report: 1. ICARDA/Embrapa database DREMS (Data Recording and Management Systems) 2.Wiki page http://elfproject.wikispaces.com; ILRI Report: 1. http://livestockfish.cgiar.org & http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/ 2. http://livestockfish.cgiar.org/category/countries/nicaragua/ 3. http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/VCD+Nicaragua; Uganda VC Report: 1. http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/VCD+Uganda 2.http://safefoodfairfood.wikispaces.com/ Tanzania VC Report: 1. http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/VCD+Tanzania 2. http://safefoodfairfood.wikispaces.com/Dairy+in+Tanzania; Vietnam VC Report: 1. http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/VCD+Vietnam.2.http://safefoodfairfood.wikispaces.com/ 3.http://vietpigs.wordpress.com; Targeting Theme Report: 1. http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/targeting+component; ICARDA Report: 1. http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/VCD+Ethiopia; Tanzania VC Report: 1.http://livestock-fish.wikispaces.com/VCD+Tanzania

Explanatory Note 4: Number of technologies/NRM practices under research in the program (Phase I)
ILRI Report: 1. Vaccines for ECF, PPR, CBPP 2. Diagnostic assays for CBPP, ASF; ILRI Report: 1. Fodder chopping 2.Underutilised feeds 3. Supplementation 4.Grassland improvements 5.Fodder grasses; ICARDA Report: 1. 12 barley cultivars (Rihane-03, Zanbaka, Furat-7, Atahualpa, Arabi Abiad, Vmorales, Alanda-01, Tadmor, Arabi Aswad, Furat-2, Nawair-1, and Radical); Nicaragua VC Report: 1. *Brachiaria* hybrids and accessions; Tanzania VC Report: 1. 3 Dairy Hub Models; World Fish Report: 1. Formation of women retailer groups and support 2. Testing approaches for aquaculture development in Upper Egypt 3.Three shrimp farming technologies; Egypt VC Report: 1. Abbassia strain of Nile tilapia; ILRI Report: 1. Interventions identified to improve nature and level of women's participation in retail nodes of VCs.

Explanatory Note 5: Number of technologies/NRM practices released by public and private sector partners globally (phase II)
ILRI Report: 1. Vaccine for ECF; ICARDA Report: 1. Community-based small ruminant breeding; Egypt VC Report: 1. Abbassia strain of Nile tilapia

Explanatory Note 6: Number of technologies/NRM practices released by public and private sector partners globally (phase III)
ILRI Report: 1. Vaccine – ECF.

Annex 2. Financial Reports

Report Description	L101
Name of Report	CRP Cumuative Financial Summary
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012 **CRP Nr 3.7**

	(a) Cumulative budget per annual financial plans.					(b) Actual Expenses - Cumulative					(c) Variance - Cumulative				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
Africa Rice					-					-	-	-	-	-	-
Bioversity					-					-	-	-	-	-	-
CIAT	1,176	196	2,322	-	3,694	1,175	-	1,495	-	2,670	1	196	827	-	1,024
CIFOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CIMMYT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CIP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ICARDA	450	-	137	-	587	421	-	112	-	533	29	-	25	-	54
ICRISAT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFPRI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IITA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ILRI	7,572	707	5,611	-	13,890	4,987	349	4,460	-	9,796	2,585	358	1,151	-	4,094
IRRI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IWMI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
World Agroforestry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
World Fish	1,135	147	2,064	1,010	4,356	1,135	-	1,873	1,010	4,018	-	147	191	-	338
Totals for CRP	**10,333**	**1,050**	**10,134**	**1,010**	**22,527**	**7,718**	**349**	**7,939**	**1,010**	**17,016**	**2,615**	**701**	**2,195**	**-**	**5,511**
	46%	**5%**	**45%**	**4%**	**100%**	**34%**	**2%**	**35%**	**4%**	**76%**	**47%**	**13%**	**40%**	**0%**	**100%**

Notes

All figures shown here are illustrative only, and are in USD 000's

Section (a) is cumulative - includes financial plan of current year as well as those of prior years.

Section (b) is cumulative - refers to all costs since inception, not just current year.

Section (c) amounts are the differences between Sections (a) and (b).

Report Description	**L106**					
Name of Report	CRP Annual Funding Summary					
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office					
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months					
Period	**1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012**				**CRP Nr 3.7**	
PART 1 - Annual FINANCE PLAN (Totals for Windows 1 and 2 combined)						
Approved Level for Year - Initial Approval					10,333	
Approved Level for Year - Final Amount					10,333	
PART 2 - Funding Summary for Year						
		CRP 2012 Actual Funding				
	Window 1	**Window 2**	**Window 3**	**Bilateral funding**	**Total Funding**	
W1 Donors	-	-	-	-	-	
Australia		1,603			1,603	
Netherlands		4,200			4,200	
Sweden		5,350			5,350	
USA		4,000			4,000	
India		80			80	
Finland		650			650	
Mexico	-	-	490	-	490	
USAID	-	-	108	-	108	
EC/IFAD			453		453	
The Agricultural Research Center of the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Egypt				3	3	
ACIAR				626	626	
ASARECA				55	55	
BBSRC				291	291	
BMZ				67	67	
CHINA				41	41	
Consortium				80	80	
CYMMIT				100	100	
DFG - Borstel-German Research Foundation				13	13	
DOW				433	433	
EC/IFAD				300	300	
EMBRAPA				80	80	
European Commission				34	34	
FAO				48	48	
FORD FOUNDATION				86	86	
GIZ				735	735	
GTZ				689	689	
Heifer Project International				561	561	
ICRAF				14	14	
IFAD				512	512	
IFPRI				196	196	

	IRRI				493	493
	IRELAND EMBASSY				582	582
	JAPAN				118	118
	JVC -National Science Foundation				53	53
	Korea				131	131
	NEPAD/AWG-PAF				31	31
	New York University				124	124
	Philippines Bureau of Agricultural Research				108	108
	Rajiv Gandhi Center for Aquaculture				47	47
	Resources Legacy Fund				44	44
	Sokoine University of Agriculture				78	78
	Sri Lanka National Aquaculture Development Authority of Sri Lanka, Min of Fisheriesand Aquatic Resources				3	3
	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation				1,404	1,404
	UNE				345	345
	UNEP-GEF				209	209
	USAID				557	557
	University of Vermont				120	120
	University of Wageningen				14	14
	UNOPS-GEF				371	371
	Totals for CRP	**-**	**15,883**	**1,050**	**10,134**	**27,067**
Notes						
	All figures are in USD 000's					
	Amount shown for Window 1 donors is total, as these funds are co-mingled					
	Amounts shown for Window 2 donors are as per Report L411.					
	Amounts shown for Window 3 donors are as per Report L201					
	Amounts shown for Bilateral funding are as per Report L201					

Report Description	L111
Name of Report	CRP Annual Financial Summary
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

	(a) CRP2012 Fin plan approved budget					(b) CRP 2012 Expenditure					(c) Variance this Year				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
Africa Rice					-					-	-	-	-	-	-
Bioversity					-					-	-	-	-	-	-
CIAT	1,176	196	2,322	-	3,694	1,175	-	1,495	-	2,670	1	196	827	-	1,024
CIFOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CIMMYT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CIP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ICARDA	450	-	137	-	587	421	-	112	-	533	29	-	25	-	54
ICRISAT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IFPRI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IITA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ILRI	7,572	707	5,611	-	13,890	4,987	349	4,460	-	9,796	2,585	358	1,151	-	4,094
IRRI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IWMI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
World Agroforestry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
World Fish	1,135	147	2,064	1,010	4,356	1,135	-	1,873	1,010	4,018	-	147	191	-	338
Totals for CRP	**10,333**	**1,050**	**10,134**	**1,010**	**22,527**	**7,718**	**349**	**7,939**	**1,010**	**17,016**	**2,615**	**701**	**2,195**	**-**	**5,511**
	2	**0**	**2**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**-**	**1**

Notes

All figures are for current year. Amounts shown here are in USD 000's

Section (a) amounts are as per the latest financing plan

Section (b) amounts are for actual expenses in current year.

Section (c) amounts are the differences between Sections (a) and (b).

Report Description	L121
Name of Report	CRP Financial Report - Expenditure by natural classification (by Center)
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

Period 1 January 2011 - 31 December 2012

	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2 Funds	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
Total CRP															
Personnel	5,090	238	4,135	606	10,069	3,644	226	3,023	606	7,498	1,446	12	1,113	-	2,571
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	41	-	1,318	46	1,406	16	-	1,084	46	1,146	25	-	235	-	260
Supplies and Services	2,950	655	2,893	208	6,706	2,323	39	2,210	208	4,781	626	616	683	-	1,925
Operational Travel	457	63	497	54	1,071	288	35	638	54	1,015	169	28	(141)	-	56
Depreciation	-	-	89	-	89	-	-	47	-	47	-	-	42	-	42
Sub-total of Direct Costs	**8,537**	**956**	**8,933**	**914**	**19,341**	**6,272**	**300**	**7,001**	**914**	**14,487**	**2,265**	**656**	**1,932**	**-**	**4,853**
Indirect Costs	1,796	94	1,201	95	3,186	1,446	49	937	95	2,528	349	45	263	-	658
Total - all Costs	**10,333**	**1,050**	**10,134**	**1,010**	**22,527**	**7,718**	**349**	**7,939**	**1,010**	**17,016**	**2,615**	**701**	**2,195**	**-**	**5,511**
Amounts for each participating center below:															
ILRI															
Personnel	3,635	188	2,783	-	6,606	2,145	226	1,777	-	4,147	1,490	(38)	1,007	-	2,459
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	-	-	308	-	308	-	-	316	-	316	-	-	(7)	-	(7)
Supplies and Services	2,330	414	1,641	-	4,385	1,718	39	1,425	-	3,182	611	375	217	-	1,203
Operational Travel	337	38	180	-	556	211	35	409	-	655	126	3	(228)	-	(99)
Depreciation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(2)	-	(2)	-	-	2	-	2
Sub-total of Direct Costs	**6,301**	**640**	**4,914**	**-**	**11,855**	**4,075**	**300**	**3,923**	**-**	**8,298**	**2,227**	**340**	**991**	**-**	**3,557**
Indirect Costs	1,271	67	697	-	2,035	912	49	536	-	1,498	358	18	160	-	537
Total - all Costs	**7,572**	**707**	**5,611**	**-**	**13,890**	**4,987**	**349**	**4,460**	**-**	**9,796**	**2,585**	**358**	**1,151**	**-**	**4,094**
ICARDA															
Personnel	244	-	34	-	279	263	-	34	-	298	(19)	-	-	-	(19)
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	34	-	9	-	43	9	-	9	-	18	25	-	(0)	-	25
Supplies and Services	53	-	43	-	96	55	-	34	-	89	(2)	-	9	-	8
Operational Travel	45	-	31	-	76	23	-	22	-	45	21	-	9	-	31
Depreciation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sub-total of Direct Costs	**377**	**-**	**117**	**-**	**494**	**351**	**-**	**99**	**-**	**449**	**26**	**-**	**19**	**-**	**45**
Indirect Costs	73	-	19	-	93	70	-	13	-	83	3	-	6	-	9
Total - all Costs	**450**	**-**	**137**	**-**	**587**	**421**	**-**	**112**	**-**	**533**	**29**	**-**	**25**	**-**	**54**
CIAT															
Personnel	510	50	595	-	1,156	536	-	516	-	1,051	(25)	50	79	-	104
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	-	-	588	-	588	-	-	338	-	338	-	-	250	-	250
Supplies and Services	433	94	691	-	1,218	429	-	349	-	778	4	94	342	-	440
Operational Travel	30	25	148	-	203	8	-	114	-	122	22	25	34	-	81
Depreciation	-	-	48	-	48	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	45	-	45
Sub-total of Direct Costs	**974**	**169**	**2,069**	**-**	**3,212**	**973**	**-**	**1,319**	**-**	**2,292**	**1**	**169**	**750**	**-**	**920**
Indirect Costs	202	27	253	-	482	202	-	176		378	-	27	77	-	104
Total - all Costs	**1,176**	**196**	**2,322**	**-**	**3,694**	**1,175**	**-**	**1,495**	**-**	**2,670**	**1**	**196**	**827**	**-**	**1,024**
World Fish															
Personnel	700	-	722	606	2,028	700	-	696	606	2,002	(0)	-	27	-	27
Collaborator Costs - CGIAR Centers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Collaborator Costs - Partners	7	-	413	46	466	7	-	421	46	474	(0)	-	(8)	-	(8)
Supplies and Services	134	147	518	208	1,007	121	-	403	208	733	12	147	115	-	274
Operational Travel	45	-	138	54	237	45	-	94	54	193	-	-	44	-	44
Depreciation	-	-	41	-	41	-	-	47	-	47	-	-	(6)	-	(6)
Sub-total of Direct Costs	**886**	**147**	**1,833**	**914**	**3,780**	**874**	**-**	**1,661**	**914**	**3,449**	**12**	**147**	**172**	**-**	**331**
Indirect Costs	249	-	231	95	576	261	-	212	95	569	(12)	-	19	-	7
Total - all Costs	**1,135**	**147**	**2,064**	**1,010**	**4,356**	**1,135**	**-**	**1,873**	**1,010**	**4,018**	**0**	**147**	**191**	**-**	**338**

Notes

All figures shown here are in USD 000's

Totals within this report must agree with amounts reported in L111.

Report Description	L131
Name of Report	CRP Themes Report (by Center, and Funding Source)
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses this Year					Unspent Budget				
	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding	Windows 1 & 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center funds	Total Funding
CRP Report - by Themes															
Animal Health	1,555	255	2,011	-	3,821	1,178	-	1,196	-	2,374	378	255	815	-	1,447
Animal Genetics	1,796	147	1,242	1,010	4,195	1,715	-	1,514	1,010	4,239	81	147	(273)	-	(44)
Feeds and Forages	1,689	196	2,338	-	4,223	1,594	-	1,638	-	3,233	94	196	700	-	990
Value Chain Development	2,086	453	3,235	-	5,774	1,751	349	2,482	-	4,583	335	104	753	-	1,191
Targetting for Sustainable Interventions	529	-	382	-	910	189	-	337	-	526	339	-	44	-	384
Gender	469	-	846	-	1,315	345	-	771	-	1,116	124	-	76	-	199
CRP Management/Coordination	2,208	-	80	-	2,288	945	-	-	-	945	1,263	-	80	-	1,343
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals for CRP	**10,333**	**1,050**	**10,134**	**1,010**	**22,527**	**7,718**	**349**	**7,939**	**1,010**	**17,016**	**2,615**	**701**	**2,195**	**-**	**5,511**
Amounts for each participating center below:															
ILRI															
Animal Health	1,555	255	2,011	-	3,821	1,178	-	1,196	-	2,374	378	255	815	-	1,447
Animal Genetics	1,100	-	849	-	1,949	1,017	-	1,162	-	2,178	83	-	(312)	-	(229)
Feeds and Forages	800	-	977	-	1,777	660	-	740	-	1,400	140	-	237	-	377
Value Chain Development	1,287	453	1,515	-	3,255	1,021	349	1,123	-	2,493	266	104	392	-	761
Targetting for Sustainable Interventions	334	-	-	-	334	2	-	-	-	2	331	-	-	-	331
Gender	288	-	178	-	466	165	-	239	-	403	123	-	(61)	-	62
CRP Management/Coordination	2,208	-	80	-	2,288	945	-	-	-	945	1,263	-	80	-	1,343
Gender Strategies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	**7,572**	**707**	**5,611**	**-**	**13,890**	**4,987**	**349**	**4,460**	**-**	**9,796**	**2,585**	**358**	**1,151**	**-**	**4,094**
ICARDA															
Animal Health					-	-		-		-	-	-	-	-	-
Animal Genetics	67	-	137	-	204	69	-	112	-	181	(2)	-	25	-	23
Feeds and Forages	177	-	-	-	177	151	-	-	-	151	26	-	-	-	26
Value Chain Development	175	-	-	-	175	179	-	-	-	179	(3)	-	-	-	(3)
Targetting for Sustainable Interventions	30	-	-	-	30	22	-	-	-	22	8	-	-	-	8
Gender	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-		-		-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender Strategies					-					-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	**450**	**-**	**137**	**-**	**587**	**421**	**-**	**112**	**-**	**533**	**29**	**-**	**25**	**-**	**54**
CIAT															
Animal Health															
Animal Genetics															
Feeds and Forages	712	196	1,360	-	2,268	784	-	898	-	1,682	(72)	196	462	-	586
Value Chain Development	446	-	723	-	1,169	374	-	452	-	825	72	-	271	-	344
Targetting for Sustainable Interventions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender	18	-	239	-	257	17	-	145	-	162	1	-	94	-	95
CRP Management/Coordination	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender Strategies					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	**1,176**	**196**	**2,322**	**-**	**3,694**	**1,175**	**-**	**1,495**	**-**	**2,670**	**1**	**196**	**827**	**-**	**1,024**
World Fish															
Animal Health					-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Animal Genetics	629	147	256	1,010	2,042	629	-	241	1,010	1,880	-	147	15	-	162
Feeds and Forages	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Value Chain Development	178	-	997	-	1,175	178	-	908	-	1,086	-	-	90	-	90
Targetting for Sustainable Interventions	165	-	382	-	546	165	-	337	-	502	-	-	44	-	44
Gender	163	-	429	-	593	163	-	387	-	550	-	-	42	-	42
CRP Management/Coordination					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender Strategies					-					-	-	-	-	-	-
Total – all Costs	**1,135**	**147**	**2,064**	**1,010**	**4,356**	**1,135**	**-**	**1,873**	**1,010**	**4,018**	**-**	**147**	**191**	**-**	**338**

CRP 2012 and 2013 Financial Reporting Templates

Report Description	
Name of Report	CRP Financial Report - Bilateral Grants (by Center)
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

CRP Nr 3.7

Period 1 January 2012 - 31 December 2012

		Expenditure		
		Annual Budget	Expenses this Year	Variance
Totals for CRP				
	Window 3	-	-	
	Mexico Government	490	-	490
	USAID	108	-	108
	EC/IFAD	453	349	104
				-
	Sub-total	1,050	349	701
	Bilateral			
	The Agricultural Research Center of the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Egypt	3	4	(1)
	ACIAR	626	308	318
	ASARECA	55	54	0
	BBSRC	291	391	(100)
	BMZ	67	24	43
	CHINA	41	26	15
	Consortium	80	17	63
	CYMMIT	100	11	89
	DFG - Borstel-German Research Foundation	13	19	(6)
	DOW	433	427	6
	EC/IFAD	300	238	62
	EMBRAPA	80	24	56
	European Commission	34	8	26
	FAO	48	48	0
	FORD FOUNDATION	86	151	(66)
	GIZ	735	427	308
	GTZ	689	523	166
	Heifer Project International	561	605	(44)
	ICRAF	14	18	(4)
	IFAD	512	398	114
	IFPRI	196	11	184
	ILRI	132	100	33
	Indian Council for Agricultural Research and Min. of Agriculture Dept of Agrl Research and Education	80	80	(0)
	INIFAP	125	0	125
	IRRI	493	423	70
	IRELAND EMBASSY	582	337	245
	JAPAN	118	90	28
	JVC -National Science Foundation	53	78	(25)
	Korea	131	202	(71)
	NEPAD/AWG-PAF	31	31	0
	New York University	124	150	(26)
	Philippines Bureau of Agricultural Research	108	103	5
	Rajiv Gandhi Center for Aquaculture	47	39	8
	Resources Legacy Fund	44	44	-
	Sokoine University of Agriculture	78	53	25
	Sri Lanka National Aquaculture Development Authority of Sri Lanka, Min of Fisheriesand Aquatic Resources	3	3	(0)
	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	1,404	1,272	132
	UNE	345	477	(132)
	UNEP-GEF	209	306	(98)
	USAID	557	118	439
	University of Vermont	120	107	13
	University of Wageningen	14	12	2
	UNOPS-GEF	371	181	190
				-
	Sub-total	10,134	7,938	2,195
	Totals for CRP	**11,184**	**8,287**	**2,897**

CRP 2012 and 2013 Financial Reporting Templates

Bilateral Grants for each participating center below:

Center 1	**(ILRI)**			
	Window 3			
	Mexico	147	-	147
	USAID	108	-	108
	EC/IFAD	453	349	104
				-
	Sub-total	707	349	358
	Bilateral			
	ACIAR	200	153	47
	BBSRC	291	391	(100)
	Consortium	80	17	63
	CHINA	41	26	15
	CYMMIT	100	11	89
	DFG - Borstel-German Research Foundation	13	19	(6)
	EMBRAPA	80	24	56
	FORD FOUNDATION	86	151	(66)
	UNOPS-GEF	371	181	190
	UNEP-GEF	209	306	(98)
	GTZ	378	348	31
	GTZ	272	146	126
	Heifer Project International	561	605	(44)
	ICRAF	14	18	(4)
	EC/IFAD	300	238	62
	IFPRI	196	11	184
	Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agricolas Pecuarias (INIFAP)	65	0	65
	IRELAND EMBASSY	582	337	245
	IRRI	397	324	72
	JVC -National Science Foundation	53	78	(25)
	Korea	131	202	(71)
	New York University	124	150	(26)
	Sokoine University of Agriculture	78	53	25
	UNE	345	477	(132)
	University of Vermont	120	107	13
	USAID	524	86	437
				-
	Sub-total	5,611	4,460	1,150
	Totals for CRP	**6,318**	**4,809**	**1,509**
Center 2	**(ICARDA)**			
	Window 3			
				-
	Sub-total	-	-	-
	Bilateral			
	IFAD	137	112	25
				-
	Sub-total	137	112	25
	Totals for CRP	**137**	**112**	**25**
Center 3	**(CIAT)**			
	Window 3			
	Mexico Goverment	196	-	196
				-
	Sub-total	196	-	196
	Bilateral			
	ACIAR	426	155	271
	BMZ	67	24	43
	DOW	433	427	6
	GIZ	735	427	308
	IFAD	375	286	89
	ILRI	108	86	23
	JAPAN	118	90	28
	INIFAP	60	-	60
				-
	Sub-total	2,322	1,495	827
	Totals for CRP	**2,518**	**1,495**	**1,023**

CRP 2012 and 2013 Financial Reporting Templates **Report L201**

Center 4 (World Fish)

Window 3			
Mexico Government	147	-	(147)
			-
Sub-total	147	-	(147)
Bilateral			
Sri Lanka National Aquaculture Development Authority of Sri Lanka, Min of Fisheriesand Aquatic Resources	3	3	(0)
The Agricultural Research Center of the Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Egypt	3	4	(1)
University of Wageningen	14	12	2
Rajiv Gandhi Center for Aquaculture	47	39	8
Indian Council for Agricultural Research and Min. of Agriculture Dept of Agrl Research and Education	80	80	(0)
Philippines Bureau of Agricultural Research	108	103	5
ASARECA	55	54	0
NEPAD/AWG-PAF	31	31	0
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation	1,404	1,272	132
European Commission	17	4	13
GTZ	39	30	9
FAO	48	48	0
ILRI	24	14	10
IRRI	62	69	(7)
USAID	34	32	1
Resources Legacy Fund	44	44	-
European Commission	17	4	13
International Rice Research Institute	34	29	5
			-
Sub-total	2,064	1,873	191
Totals for CRP	**2,211**	**1,873**	**44**

Notes

All figures shown here are in USD 000's

Donors shown are illustrative only. All donors of material amounts should be reported.

Note that an individual donor may make grants through Window 3 and bilaterally.

Totals within this report must agree with amounts reported in L111.

Report Description

Name of Report	CRP Partnerships Report
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 6 months

Institute	Country	Annual Budget					Actual Expenses - This Year					Unspent Budget				
		Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total	Windows 1 and 2	Window 3	Bilateral funding	Center Funds	Total
ILRI																
Amhara Regional Agricultural Research	Ethopia			9		9			9		9	-	-	-	-	-
Bangidsh Agrc Uni -GEF007	Bangladesh			20		20			20		20	-	-	-	-	-
CHIRAG	India			4		4			4		4	-	-	-	-	-
Centro Int Agric Tropical	Colombia			86		86			86		86	-	-	-	-	-
Ethiopia Institute of Agriculture	Ethopia			20		20			20		20	-	-	-	-	-
Friedrich-Lof-Inst - Jena-FLI	Germany			20		20			20		20	-	-	-	-	-
Friedrich-Lof-Inst -Jen-GTZ025	Germany			18		18			18		18	-	-	-	-	-
INHERE	India			9		9			9		9	-	-	-	-	-
Natinal Inst. of Animal Husbdy	Vietnam			39		39			39		39	-	-	-	-	-
Sri Lanka-Uni of Perade-GEF007	Sri Lanka			12		12			20		20	-	-	(7)	-	(7)
Tierartzliche Hochsc Hnvr-TiH	Germany			40		40			40		40	-	-	-	-	-
Univsty of Agric-Paki-GEF007	Pakistan			31		31			31		31	-	-	-	-	-
						-					-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sub-total for center	-	-	308	-	308	-	-	316	-	316	-	-	(7)	-	(7)
ICARDA																
Bako Research Center	Ethiopia	17	-	-		17	5	-	-		5	13	-	-	-	13
Debre Birhan Research Center	Ethiopia	17	-	-		17	5	-	-		5	12	-	-	-	12
Tajik Livestock Research Institute	Tajikistan	-	-	4		4	-	-	4		4	-	-	-	-	-
Animal Science Research Institute, Karaj	Iran	-	-	4		4	-	-	4		4	-	-	-	-	-
						-					-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sub-total for center	34	-	9	-	43	9	-	9	-	18	25	-	-	-	25
CIAT																
Rwanda Agriculture Board (RAB)	Rwanda			2		2			2		2	-	-	-	-	-
National Agricultural Research Organisation	Uganda			10		10			10		10	-	-	-	-	-
University of Rostock	Germany			21		21			21		21	-	-	-	-	-
Instituto Nicaraguense de Tecnologia Agropecuaria	Nicaragua			18		18			18		18	-	-	-	-	-
University of Hohenheim	Germany			47		47			47		47	-	-	-	-	-
Nars (congo)	Congo			16		16			16		16	-	-	-	-	-
Unicauca	Colombia			17		17			17		17	-	-	-	-	-
NARS (Rua, Daph, TNU,...)	Cambodia/Laos/Vietnam			275		275			150		150	-	-	125	-	125
NARS (CSIRO, AUS; Univ. Of Murdoch, AUS; MORU, THA, ...)	Laos			181		181			56		56	-	-	125	-	125
	Sub-total for center	-	-	588	-	588	-	-	338	-	338	-	-	250	-	250
World Fish																
CARE International Egypt	Egypt	-	-	342	-	342	-	-	350	-	350	-	-	(8)	-	(8)
Leibniz University Hannover	Germany	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Innpact Sarl	Grand Duchy of Luxen	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	-
BRAC	Bangladesh	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	-
BFRI	Bangladesh	-	-	15	-	15	-	-	15	-	15	-	-	-	-	-
Central Institute of Freshwater Aquaculture	India	-	-	43	-	43	-	-	43	-	43	-	-	-	-	-
Research Institute for Aquaculture	Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam	1	-	-	10	11	1	-	-	10	11	-	-	-	-	-
Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute	Bangladesh	1	-	-	4	5	1	-	-	4	5	-	-	-	-	-
Water Research Institute/CSIR, Ghana	Ghana	3	-	-	21	24	3	-	-	21	24	-	-	-	-	-
Bunda College of Agriculature	Malawi	2	-	-	11	13	2	-	-	11	13	-	-	-	-	-
						-					-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sub-total for center	7	-	413	46	466	7	-	421	46	474	-	-	(8)	-	(8)
	Totals for CRP	41	-	1,318	46	1,406	16	-	1,084	46	1,146	25	-	235	-	260

Notes

All figures shown here are in USD 000's
Amounts reported are for actual expenditure, so unliquidated advances not included.
Institutes should be clearly identifiable by name and/or acronym, plus country.
Totals within this report must agree with amounts reported in L121 "Collaborator Costs - Partners".

CRP 2012 and 2013 Financial Reporting Templates **Report L401**

Report Description	
Name of Report	CRP Funding Statement, Windows 1 and 2
Reporting Line	Lead Center Report to Consortium Office
Frequency/Period	Every 3 months

PART 1 - REPORT OF LEAD CENTER (CIAT used as example)

Opening Balance - 1 January		-
W1 Receipts from Consortium Office (actual dates)		
Total Receipts		-
W2 Receipts from Consortium Office (actual dates)		
17-Jan-12	2,900	
21-Jun-12	1,261	
26-Oct-12	597	
29-Oct-12	717	
27-Nov-12	4,214	
20-Dec-12	4,555	
Total Receipts		14,244
Transfers to CG Partners		
CIAT	(474)	
ICARDA	(181)	
World Fish	(456)	
Total Disbursments		(1,111)
Expenditure by Lead Center (ILRI)		(4,987)
Unliquidated Advances to ILRI Partners		-
Funds held - end of Period		**8,146**

PART 2 - REPORT OF CGIAR CENTERS

	Funds held - start of Period	Transfers from Lead Center	Expenditure	Unliquidated Advances to Partners	Funds held - end of Period
CIAT		474	(1,175)	-	(701)
ICARDA		181	(421)	-	(240)
World Fish		456	(1,135)	-	(679)
Totals	**-**	**1,111**	**(2,731)**	**-**	**(1,620)**

Notes

Amounts reported are in USD 000's
Report is for each financial year.
Quarterly Reports during year are on a cumulative basis.

CRP 2012 and 2013 Financial Reporting Templates **Report L411**

Report Description							
Name of Report			CRP Funding Statement, Window 2				
Reporting Line			Lead Center Report to Consortium Office				
Frequency/Period			Every 6 months				
	Date	**Donor Currency**			**USD**		
Year 1 - 2011							
Receipts from Donors							
USA		Usd	3,000		3,000		
Finland (to be confirmed)		Euro	500		650		estimated
						3,650	
Transfers to Lead Center (via CO)							
(if applicable)						-	
Other Disbursments							
CSP paid to Window 1						(73)	estimated
Funds held by Trustee - end of Period	**31-Dec-11**					**3,577**	
Year 2 - 2012							
Receipts from Donors							
Australia		AUD	487	-	478		estimated
Australia		AUD	??	-	652		estimated
Netherlands		USD	4,200	-	4,200		
Sweden		SKR	35,000	-	5,350		estimated
USA		USD	4,000	-	4,000		
India		??	??	-	80		estimated
Australia		AUD	455	-	473		estimated
Finland		Euro	500	-	650		estimated
						15,883	
Transfers to Lead Center (via CO)							
Transfer 1	17/1/2012				2,900		
Transfer 2	21/6/2012				1,261		
Transfer 3	26/10/2012				1,314		
Transfer 4	27/11/2012				4,214		
Transfer 5	20/12/2012				4,555		
						(14,244)	
Other Disbursments							
CSP paid to Window 1						(318)	
Funds held by Trustee - end of Period	**31-Dec-12**					**4,898**	

Notes

Amounts should be reported in USD 000's

This reports is on a cumulative basis (prior periods also shown)